IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
(Attorney Docket No. 23607US01)

In the Application of:

Jetha et al.

Application No.: 10/682,298

Filed: October 10, 2003

For: DETAIL IN CONTEXT LENSES FOR MULTI LAYER IMAGES

Examiner: Jeffrey J. Chow

Art Unit: 2628

Confirmation No.: 7344

Customer No.: 23446

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via EFS-Web to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on October 28, 2011.

/Jeffrey B. Huter/
Jeffrey B. Huter
Reg. No. 41,086

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an appeal from a Final Action dated June 28, 2011, hereinafter the "Final Action." A Response After Final was filed on August 19, 2011, hereinafter the "Response After Final," and an Advisory Action was mailed on September 9, 2011, hereinafter the "Advisory Action." A Notice of Appeal was filed on September 26, 2011 within the shortened statutory period for reply, which extended to September 28, 2011, 2011.

The present Appeal Brief is timely filed within the two month period following the Notice of Appeal, which extends to November 28, 2011 since November 26, 2011 is a Saturday. The appellant respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, hereinafter the "Board," reverse the final rejection of claims 1-15, 19-34, 36-45, and 47-51 of the present application.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(i))

Noregin Assets N.V., L.L.C., having a place of business at 160 Greentree Drive, Suite 101, Dover, Delaware 19904, has acquired the entire right, title and interest in and to the invention, the application, and any and all patents to be obtained therefor, as set forth in the Assignment recorded at Reel 022127, Frame 0727 in the PTO Assignment Search room.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ii))

The appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iii))

The present application includes pending claims 1-15, 19-34, 36-45, and 47-51 of the present application. The Final Action rejected claims 1-15, 19-34, 36-45, and 47-51 of the present application. The appellant identifies claims 1-15, 19-34, 36-45, and 47-51 of the present application as the claims that are being appealed. The text of pending claims 1-15, 19-34, 36-45, and 47-51 of the present application is provided in the Claims Appendix.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv))

The appellant amended claims 1, 20, 48, and 49 in the Response After Final. The Advisory Action entered such amendments and indicated that such amendments overcame the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v))

Claims 2-15 and 19 depend from independent claim 1. Claim 1 recites:

1. A machine-implemented method, comprising:

in response to receiving an indication to edit a region[1] of an image, distorting with a data processing system[2] a predetermined portion of a first layer of the image to produce a distorted image[3] for the region having a magnification that is not uniform across the region;[4]

overlaying the distorted image on a second layer of the image to present an overlaid image on a display;[5]

altering a presentation for the first layer on the display in response to edits made to the first layer;[6]

propagating edits made to the first layer of the overlaid image through to a presentation for the second layer on the display;[7] and

saving edits made to the presentations for the first layer and the second layer as one or more bookmarks that permit subsequent recall and application to the first layer and the second layer.[8]

---

[1] See, e.g., region 681 of Figs. 6-9 and 12; and paragraph [0120] of U.S. Pub. 2004/0125138. Note future paragraph references are in regard to U.S. Pub. 2004/0125128.

[2] See, e.g., data processing system 300 of Fig. 3.

[3] See, e.g., distorted image 680 of Figs. 6-9 and 12, and paragraph [0120].

[4] See, e.g., block 1402 of Fig. 14, and paragraph [0120].

[5] See, e.g., block 1403 of Fig. 14 and paragraph [0122].

[6] See, e.g., paragraphs [0088] and [0093] and Fig. 7.

[7] See, e.g., block 1404 of Fig. 14 and paragraph [0123].

[8] See, e.g., paragraph [0113].

Claims 21-34, 50, and 51 depend from independent claim 20. Claim 20 recites:

20. A machine-implemented method comprising:

distorting with a data processing system a predetermined portion of a first layer of an image to produce a distorted image for a region of the image having a magnification that is not uniform across the region;[9]

overlaying the distorted image on a second layer of the image for presentation on a display;[10]

altering a digital representation for the first layer in response to edits made to the first layer;[11]

propagating edits made to the first layer to a digital representation of the second layer to obtain an altered digital representation of the second layer; and[12]

saving the altered digital representation for the first layer and the altered digital representation for the second layer.[13]

---

[9] See, e.g., block 1402 of Fig. 14, and paragraph [0120].

[10] See, e.g., block 1403 of Fig. 14 and paragraph [0122].

[11] See, e.g., paragraphs [0088] and [0093] and Fig. 7.

[12] See, e.g., block 1404 of Fig. 14 and paragraph [0123].

[13] See, e.g., paragraph [0094].

Claims 37-45 and 47 depend from independent claim 36. Claim 36 recites:

36. A data processing system[14] comprising:

a processor;[15]

a display;[16] and

memory[17] comprising instructions that are executable on the processor to cause the data processing system to perform operations[18] comprising:

> in response to receiving an indication to edit a region of an image, distorting a predetermined portion of a first layer of the image to produce a distorted image for the region having a magnification that is not uniform across the region;[19]
>
> overlaying the distorted image on a second layer of the image to present an overlaid image on the display;[20]
>
> altering a presentation for the first layer on the display in response to edits made to the first layer;[21]
>
> propagating edits made to the first layer of the overlaid image through to a presentation for the second layer on the display;[22] and

---

[14] See, e.g., data processing system 300 in Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0066] and [0067].

[15] See, e.g., CPU 320 in Fig. 3 and paragraph [0066].

[16] See, e.g., display 340 in Fig. 3 and paragraph [0066].

[17] See, e.g., memory 300 in Fig. 3 and paragraph [0066].

[18] See, e.g., instructions of data carrier product, computer software product, and integrated circuit product described in paragraphs [0125]-[0127].

[19] See, e.g., block 1402 of Fig. 14, and paragraph [0120].

[20] See, e.g., block 1403 of Fig. 14 and paragraph [0122].

[21] See, e.g., paragraphs [0088] and [0093] and Fig. 7.

[22] See, e.g., block 1404 of Fig. 14 and paragraph [0123].

saving edits made to the presentations for the first layer and the second layer as one or more bookmarks that permit subsequent recall and application to the first layer and the second layer.[23]

---

[23] See, e.g., paragraph [0113].

Claim 49 depends from independent claim 48. Claim 48 recites:

48. One or more non-transitory computer-readable media comprising instructions stored thereon that, responsive to execution by a data processing system, causes the data processing system to perform operations[24] comprising:

in response to receiving an indication to edit a region of an image, distorting a predetermined portion of a first layer of the image to produce a distorted image for the region having a magnification that is not uniform across the region;[25]

overlaying the distorted image on a second layer of the image to present an overlaid image on a display;[26]

altering a presentation for the first layer on the display in response to edits made to the first layer;[27]

propagating edits made to the first layer of the overlaid image through a presentation for the second layer on the display;[28] and

saving edits made to the presentations for the first layer and the second layer as one or more bookmarks that permit subsequent recall and application to the first layer and the second layer.[29]

---

[24] See, e.g., data carrier product, computer software product, and integrated circuit product described in paragraphs [0125]-[0127].

[25] See, e.g., block 1402 of Fig. 14, and paragraph [0120].

[26] See, e.g., block 1403 of Fig. 14 and paragraph [0122].

[27] See, e.g., paragraphs [0088] and [0093] and Fig. 7.

[28] See, e.g., block 1404 of Fig. 14 and paragraph [0123].

[29] See, e.g., paragraph [0113].

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vi))

Claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 19-21, 33, 34, 36, 37, and 47-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. 2002/0044154 to Baar et al., hereinafter "Baar," in view of U.S. Pub. 2003/0052896 to Higgins et al., hereinafter "Higgins" and U.S. 6,697,067 to Callahan et al., hereinafter "Callahan."

Claims 3, 22, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr in view of Higgins and Callahan and in further view of "The digital magazine of InfoVis.net," by Dürsteler, hereinafter "Dürsteler."

Claims 4, 13, 23, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baar in view of Higgins, Callahan, and Dürsteler in further view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (paragraphs 66 and 81), hereinafter "AAPA."

Claims 5-7, 24-26, and 39-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baar in view of Higgins, Callahan, and Dürsteler, and further view of U.S. 5,638,523 to Mullet et al., hereinafter "Mullet."

Claims 8-12, 27-31, and 42-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baar in view of Higgins, Callahan, Dürsteler, Mullet, and "A Framework for Elastic Presentation Space", 1999 of Carpendale, hereinafter "Carpendale."

Claim 51 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baar in view of Higgins, Callahan, and WO 99/428854 of Witte et al., hereinafter "Witte."

ARGUMENT
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii))

The Final Action rejected claims 1-15, 19-34, 36-45, and 47-51. Reversal of the present rejections of claims 1-15, 19-34, 36-45, and 47-51 is earnestly solicited in light of the following.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Baar, Higgins, and Callahan)

The Final Action rejected claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 19-21, 33, 34, 36, 37, and 47-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. 2002/0044154 to Baar et al., hereinafter "Baar," in view of U.S. Pub. 2003/0052896 to Higgins et al., hereinafter "Higgins" and U.S. 6,697,067 to Callahan et al., hereinafter "Callahan." Reversal of the present rejection of claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 19-21, 33, 34, 36, 37, and 47-50 is earnestly solicited in light of the following.

A. Claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 19, 36, 37, and 47-49

Each of claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 19, 36, 37, and 47-49 recites, among other things, "saving edits made to the presentations for the first layer and the second layer as one or more bookmarks that permit subsequent recall and application to the first layer and the second layer." The appellant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Baar, Higgins, and Callahan does not disclose, teach, or otherwise render obvious such aspects of claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 19, 36, 37, and 47-49.

In regard to such aspects, the Final Action on page 5 concedes that Baar does not disclose "saving edits made to the presentations for the first layer and the second layer as one or more bookmarks that permit subsequent recall and application to the first layer and the second layer." Instead, the Final Action relies upon Callahan for a teaching of such aspects. In particular, the Final Action states:

> Callahan discloses an associated configuration of originalCine is saved, originalCINE can be reconfigured to the associated configuration it had when the view was selected, thereby enabling the data to be further manipulated from this point (column 10, lines 1-5).

The appellant appreciates Callahan discloses a file having a 3-dimensional cube of data as well as a sequence of views of the 3-dimensional cube of data. See, e.g., Callahan column 12, lines 8-18. However, such views merely provide the parameters needed to render a particular 2-diminesional view or plane cut through the 3-dimensional cube of data. Such parameters, however, do not edit or otherwise alter a first layer or a second layer of the 3-dimensional cube of data. Instead, the saved views select a 2-dimensional plane of data from the 3-dimensional cube and specify parameters for rendering such selected plane upon a 2-dimensional display screen.

The Final Action, however, on page 6 takes the position that in light of such teaching of saved views it would have been obvious to "modify Baar's system to use an associated configuration that keeps track of edits made to the original images." The sole reason given for this leap from saved views to saved edits is "one would be motivated to do so because this would allow other users to see how changes were made from the original images or help save time in editing when making the same edits."

One problem with the above statements is that the Final Action provides no factual support for such statements. The appellant appreciates that such a combination may have the stated advantages. However, the Final Action and Advisory Action provide no facts to support the notion that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the proposed combination was desirable based upon the teachings of Callahan or based upon the combined teachings of Baar, Higgins, and Callahan. In particular, the appellant submits that a more logical combination of Callahan with

Baar's system modified by Higgins is to provide such modified system with support for saved views in the manner as taught by Callahan.

There simply is nothing in the record beyond unsupported conclusory statements and appellant's own specification that would lead one skilled in the art to combine Baar, Higgins, and Callahan in a manner in which edits to a first and second layer are saved as bookmarks. The Final Action merely concludes that one of ordinary skill in the art would make the proposed combination since such combination "would allow other users to see how changes were made from the original images or help save time in editing when making the same edits." However, as noted by the Supreme Court in *KSR International Co. v. Tele-flex Inc. (KSR)*, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007) at 1396:

> The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious.
>
> [R]ejections on obviousness cannot be sustained with mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.

The appellant respectfully submits that the conclusory statement that "one would be motivated to do so because this would allow other users to see how changes were made from the original images or help save time in editing when making the same edits" does not satisfy the *KSR* mandate requiring clear reasoning based on factual support.

In light of arguments similar to those presented above, the Advisory Action attempted to clarify the proposed combination of Baar, Higgins, and Callahan. In particular, the Advisory Action states:

> Callahan discloses edits to a view are saved for later use (column 10, lines 1-5). The system of Baar et al (US 2002/0044154) is modified with the teaching of Higgins'

> editing multiple layers of a map and the teaching of Callahan saving edits for later use to achieve a system of making the same edits to multiple layers of a map and saving the edits for subsequent recall.

The appellant disagrees with such assessment. As previously explained, Callahan does not teaching saving "edits" for later use. Callahan at column 10, lines 1-5 teaches saving a configuration associated with a view of the originalCINE data. Callahan further teaches that the saved configuration may be later applied to the originalCINE data in order to present a view of the originalCINE data. Thus, Callahan does not teach saving edits as the Final Action and Advisory Action contend but instead teaches saving configuration data that define a particular 2-dimensional view of the 3-dimensional originalCINE data so that the 2-dimensional view of the 3-dimensional originalCINE data may be retrieved and rendered at a later time without modifying the 3-dimensional originalCINE data.

Since Callahan does not teach saving edits as contended, the proposed combination of Baar, Higgins, and Callahan does not arrive at and/or otherwise render obvious claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 19, 36, 37, and 47-49. Moreover, as noted above, the Final Action and/or Advisory action fail to present a legally sufficient factual basis and legally sufficient reasoning to support a conclusion that combining Baar, Higgins, and Callahan in the proposed manner would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For one or more of the above reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 19, 36, 37, and 47-49 is earnestly solicited.

B. Claims 20, 21, 33, 34, and 50

Each of claims 20, 21, 33, 34, and 50 recites "saving the altered digital representation for the first layer and the altered digital representation for the second layer." The Final Action again relies upon Callahan's saved views for a teaching and/or motivation for modifying Baar's system to save the altered digital representation for the first layer and the altered digital representation for the second layer. In particular, the Final Action on page 8 states:

> Baar does not expressly disclose saving the altered digital representation for the first layer and altered digital representation for the second layer. Callahan discloses an associated configuration of the originalCine is saved, originalCINE can be reconfigured to the associated configuration it had when the view was selected, thereby enabling the data to be further manipulated from this point (column 10, lines 1-5).

As noted by the Final Action, Callahan discloses saving configuration data. The Callahan configuration data is used to present a view of the originalCINE data. However, the saved configuration data does not alter the 3-dimensional originalCINE data. Moreover, the configuration data itself is not a digital representation of the originalCINE data or a digital representation of a layer of the originalCINE data. Thus, while Callahan may teach saving configuration data that may be used to present a view of the originalCINE data, Callahan does not teach saving an altered digital representation of a layer of the originalCINE data. The Final Action admits that Baar does not teach "saving the altered digital representation for the first layer and the altered digital representation for the second layer," but instead relies upon Callahan to teach such aspects. Since Callahan does not in fact teach saving an altered digital representation of a layer of the originalCINE data, the proposed combination of Baar, Higgins, and Callahan does not arrive at the invention of claims 20, 21, 33, 34, and 50 for reasons similar to those presented above in regard to claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 19, 36, 37, and 47-49.

Moreover, the Final Action in regard to claims 20, 21, 33, 34, and 50 again provides an insufficient factual basis and reasoning to support its conclusion that one would be motivated to combine Baar, Higgins, and Callahan in the proposed manner. As noted above, the Final Action provides no factual basis for its conclusion one would be motivated to make such a combination because "this would allow other user to see how changes were made from the original images or help save time in editing when making the same edits."

For one or more of the above reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claims 20, 21, 33, 34, and 50 is earnestly solicited.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Baar, Higgins, Callahan and Dürsteler)

The Final Action rejected claims 3, 22, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr in view of Higgins and Callahan and in further view of "The digital magazine of InfoVis.net," by Dürsteler, hereinafter "Dürsteler." Each of claims 3, 22, and 38 includes one of claims 1, 20, and 36 as a base claim. Neither the Final Action nor the Advisory Action relies upon Dürsteler for the above discussed missing aspects in relation to claims 1, 20, and 36. As such, each of claims 3, 22, and 38 is allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to its respective base claim.

For one or more of the above reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claims 3, 22, and 38 is respectfully requested.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Baar, Higgins, Callahan, Dürsteler, and AAPA)

The Final Action rejected claims 4, 13, 23, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baar in view of Higgins, Callahan, and Dürsteler in further view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (paragraphs 66 and 81), hereinafter "AAPA." Each of claims 4, 13, 23 and 32 includes one of claims 1 and 20 as a base claim. Neither the Final Action nor the Advisory Action relies upon Dürsteler and/or AAPA for the above discussed missing aspects in relation to claims 1 and 20. As such, each of claims 4, 13, 23, and 32 is allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to its respective base claim.

For one or more of the above reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claims 4, 13, 23, and 32 is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Baar, Higgins, Callahan, Dürsteler, and Mullet)

The Final Action rejected claims 5-7, 24-26, and 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baar in view of Higgins, Callahan, and Dürsteler, and further view of U.S. 5,638,523 to Mullet et al., hereinafter "Mullet." Each of claims 5-7, 24-26, and 39-41 includes one of claims 1, 20, and 36 as a base claim. Moreover, neither the Final Action nor the Advisory Action relies upon Dürsteler and/or Mullet for the above discussed missing aspects in relation to claims 1, 20 and 36. As such, each of claims 5-7, 24-26, and 39-41 is allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to its respective base claim.

For one or more of the above reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claims 5-7, 24-26, and 39-41 is respectfully requested.

V. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Baar, Higgins, Callahan, Dürsteler, Mullet, and Carpendale)

The Final Action rejected claims 8-12, 27-31, and 42-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baar in view of Higgins, Callahan, Dürsteler, Mullet, and "A Framework for Elastic Presentation Space", 1999 of Carpendale, hereinafter "Carpendale." Each of claims 8-12, 27-31, and 42-45 includes one of claims 1, 20, and 36 as a base claim. Neither the Final Action nor the Advisory Action relies upon Dürsteler, Mullet, and/or Carpendale for the above discussed missing aspects in relation to claims 1, 20 and 36. As such, each of claims 8-12, 27-31, and 42-45 is allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to its respective base claim.

For one or more of the above reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claims 8-12, 27-31, and 42-45 is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Baar, Higgins, Callahan, and Witte)

The Final Action rejected claim 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baar in view of Higgins, Callahan, and WO 99/428854 of Witte et al., hereinafter "Witte." Claim 51 includes 20 as a base claim. Neither the Final Action nor the Advisory Action relies upon Witte for the above discussed missing aspects in relation to claim 20.

Moreover, claim 51 further recites "said distorting comprising producing a focal region with uniform magnification of the first layer and a plurality of shoulder regions about the focal region, and each shoulder region of the plurality of shoulder regions presenting a different layer of the image with non-uniform magnification." The Final Action admits "Baar does not expressly disclose each shoulder region of a plurality of shoulder regions presenting a different layer of the image with non-uniform magnification." In regard to such aspects, the Final Action and the Advisory Action rely upon a combination of Baar and Witte. In particular, the Final Action notes that Baar discloses "detailed layer of a geographic map containing, for example, detailed precipitation, population, and disease data are only displayed in a particular region of interest, while displaying the generally geographic map surrounding the region of interest (paragraph 47), and the bottom and top layered lenses provide a continuous transition (paragraph 32 and Figure 4)." The Final Action and Advisory Action further contend that it would have been obvious to replace the area surrounding the Baar region of interest with the Witte superimposed image that includes a radar image and an optical image.

For reasons similar to those stated above, the Final Action and/or Advisory Action provide an insufficient factual basis and insufficient reasoning to arrive at the conclusion that "[o]ne would be motivated to [combine Witte with Baar as proposed] because this would aide users on providing additional information in the transition regions."

Regardless of whether there is a sufficient factual basis and sufficient reasoning to make the proposed combination, the appellant submits that the proposed combination does not arrive at claim 51. The Witte abstract teaches generating an image comprising a radar image with superimposed optical images. Thus, if one of ordinary skill in the art were to replace the area around the Baar region of interest with the Witte image, the area around the Baar region of interest would display the Witte radar image with a superimposed optical image. However, claim 51 recites "a plurality of shoulder regions about the focal region, and each shoulder region of the plurality of shoulder regions presenting a different layer of the image with non-uniform magnification." Even if the area around the Baar region has a plurality of shoulder regions, the proposed combination results in each of these shoulder regions displaying the same layers (i.e., the Witte radar image with superimposed optical image). There is nothing in Baar, Higgins, Callahan, and/or Witte that discloses, teaches, and/or otherwise renders obvious splitting the Witte superimposed image into layers so that each shoulder region displays a different image layer.

Since the proposed combination results in the shoulder regions around the Baar region of interest presenting the same image layer or layers, the proposed combination does not arrive at claim 51. For one or more of the above reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claim 51 is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, the appellant submits that claims 1-15, 19-34, 36-45, and 47-51 are in condition for allowance. Reversal of the examiner's rejection and issuance of a patent on the application are, therefore, respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 28, 2011

By: /Jeffrey B. Huter/
Jeffrey B. Huter
Reg. No. 41,086
Attorney for the Appellant

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
(T) 312 775 8000
(F) 312 775 8100

CLAIMS APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))

1. A machine-implemented method, comprising:

in response to receiving an indication to edit a region of an image, distorting with a data processing system a predetermined portion of a first layer of the image to produce a distorted image for the region having a magnification that is not uniform across the region;

overlaying the distorted image on a second layer of the image to present an overlaid image on a display;

altering a presentation for the first layer on the display in response to edits made to the first layer;

propagating edits made to the first layer of the overlaid image through to a presentation for the second layer on the display; and

saving edits made to the presentations for the first layer and the second layer as one or more bookmarks that permit subsequent recall and application to the first layer and the second layer.

2. The machine-implemented method of claim 1 wherein the distorting further includes:

creating a lens surface for the distorted image; and

transforming the predetermined portion of the first layer by applying a distortion function to define the lens surface to the predetermined portion of the first layer.

3. The machine-implemented method of claim 2 wherein the creating further includes displaying a graphical user interface ("GUI") over the distorted image for adjusting the lens surface.

4. The machine-implemented method of claim 3 wherein the lens surface includes a focal region and a base region and the GUI includes:

an icon configured to adjust a magnification for the lens surface;

an icon configured to adjust a degree of scooping for the lens surface;

an icon configured to adjust a size and a shape for the focal region;

an icon configured to adjust a size and a shape for the base region;

an icon configured to adjust a location for the lens surface within the first layer;

an icon configured to adjust a location for the base region within the first layer; or

a fold control element configured to adjust a degree and direction of folding of the focal region relative to the base region.

5. The machine-implemented method of claim 3 wherein the GUI further supports at least one of an icon or a keyboard input for switching between the first and second layers.

6. The machine-implemented method of claim 3 wherein the GUI further supports at least one of an icon or a keyboard input for selecting among the first and second layers.

7. The machine-implemented method of claim 3 wherein the GUI further supports at least one of an icon or a keyboard input for selecting a folded lens surface.

8. The machine-implemented method of claim 7 wherein the folded lens surface includes a second focal region for displaying a portion of the second layer.

9. The machine-implemented method of claim 8 wherein the focal region is folded away from an original position relative to the base region.

10. The machine-implemented method of claim 8 wherein the second focal region is located at the original position.

11. The machine-implemented method of claim 10 wherein the GUI further supports at least one of an icon or a keyboard input for selecting a user adjustable window for display in the focal region.

12. The machine-implemented method of claim 11 wherein the window is configured to display a portion of the second layer.

13. The machine-implemented method of claim 4 wherein the adjusting is performed and the indication is generated responsive to an input to cause movement of a cursor on the display.

14. The machine-implemented method of claim 1 wherein the first or second layers are one or more of raster, vector, point, or geo-referenced data layers.

15. The machine-implemented method of claim 1 wherein the indication, region, predetermined portion, first layer, distorted image, or second layer includes a plurality of the indications, regions, predetermined portions, first layers, distorted images, or second layers, respectively.

16-18. (Canceled).

19. The machine-implemented method of claim 1, further comprising applying the one or more bookmarks to alter presentations for the first layer and the second layer.

20. A machine-implemented method comprising:

distorting with a data processing system a predetermined portion of a first layer of an image to produce a distorted image for a region of the image having a magnification that is not uniform across the region;

overlaying the distorted image on a second layer of the image for presentation on a display;

altering a digital representation for the first layer in response to edits made to the first layer;

propagating edits made to the first layer to a digital representation of the second layer to obtain an altered digital representation of the second layer; and

saving the altered digital representation for the first layer and the altered digital representation for the second layer.

21. The machine-implemented method of claim 20 wherein the distorting further includes:

creating a lens surface for the distorted image; and

transforming the predetermined portion of the first layer by applying a distortion function to define the lens surface to the predetermined portion of the first layer.

22. The machine-implemented method of claim 21 wherein the creating further includes displaying a graphical user interface ("GUI") to adjust the lens surface.

23. The machine-implemented method of claim 22 wherein the lens surface includes a focal region and a base region and the GUI includes:

an icon configured to adjust a magnification for the lens surface;

an icon configured to adjust a degree of scooping for the lens surface;

an icon configured to adjust a size and a shape for the focal region;

an icon configured to adjust a size and a shape for the base region;

an icon configured to adjust a location for the lens surface within the first layer;

an icon configured to adjust a location for the base region within the first layer; or

a fold control element configured to adjust a degree and direction of folding of the focal region relative to the base region.

24. The machine-implemented method of claim 22 wherein the GUI further supports at least one of an icon or a keyboard input for switching between the first and second layers.

25. The machine-implemented method of claim 22 wherein the GUI further supports at least one of an icon or a keyboard input for selecting among the first and second layers.

26. The machine-implemented method of claim 22 wherein the GUI further supports at least one of an icon or a keyboard input for selecting a folded lens surface.

27. The machine-implemented method of claim 26 wherein the folded lens surface includes a second focal region for displaying a portion of the second layer.

28. The machine-implemented method of claim 27 wherein the focal region is folded away from an original position relative to the base region.

29. The machine-implemented method of claim 27 wherein the second focal region is located at the original position.

30. The machine-implemented method of claim 29 wherein the GUI further supports at least one of an icon or a keyboard input for selecting a user adjustable window for display in the focal region.

31. The machine-implemented method of claim 30 wherein the window is configured to display a portion of the second layer.

32. The machine-implemented method of claim 23 wherein the adjusting is performed responsive to an input to cause movement of a cursor on the display.

33. The machine-implemented method of claim 20 wherein the first or second layers are one or more of raster, vector, point, or geo-referenced data layers.

34. The machine-implemented method of claim 20 wherein the region, predetermined portion, first layer, distorted image, or second layer includes a plurality of the regions, predetermined portions, first layers, distorted images, or second layers, respectively.

35. (Canceled).

36. A data processing system comprising:

a processor;

a display; and

memory comprising instructions that are executable on the processor to cause the data processing system to perform operations comprising:

in response to receiving an indication to edit a region of an image, distorting a predetermined portion of a first layer of the image to produce a distorted image for the region having a magnification that is not uniform across the region;

overlaying the distorted image on a second layer of the image to present an overlaid image on the display;

altering a presentation for the first layer on the display in response to edits made to the first layer;

propagating edits made to the first layer of the overlaid image through to a presentation for the second layer on the display; and

saving edits made to the presentations for the first layer and the second layer as one or more bookmarks that permit subsequent recall and application to the first layer and the second layer.

37. The data processing system of claim 36 wherein the distorting further includes:

creating a lens surface for the distorted image; and

transforming the predetermined portion of the first layer by applying a distortion function to define the lens surface to the predetermined portion of the first layer.

38. The data processing system of claim 37 wherein the creating further includes displaying a graphical user interface ("GUI") over the distorted image for adjusting the lens surface.

39. The data processing system of claim 38 wherein the GUI further supports at least one of an icon or a keyboard input for switching between the first and second layers.

40. The data processing system of claim 38 wherein the GUI further supports at least one of an icon or a keyboard input for selecting the first or second layers.

41. The data processing system of claim 38 wherein the GUI further supports at least one of an icon or a keyboard input for selecting a folded lens surface.

42. The data processing system of claim 41 wherein the folded lens surface includes a focal region, a base region, a second focal region for displaying a portion of the second layer.

43. The data processing system of claim 42 wherein the focal region is folded away from an original position relative to the base region.

44. The data processing system of claim 43 wherein the GUI further supports at least one of an icon or a keyboard input for selecting a user adjustable window for display in the focal region.

45. The data processing system of claim 44 wherein the window displays a portion of the second layer.

46. (Canceled).

47. The data processing system of claim 36 wherein the instructions further cause the data processing system to perform operations comprising applying the one or more bookmarks to alter presentations for the first layer and the second layer.

48. One or more non-transitory computer-readable media comprising instructions stored thereon that, responsive to execution by a data processing system, causes the data processing system to perform operations comprising:

in response to receiving an indication to edit a region of an image, distorting a predetermined portion of a first layer of the image to produce a distorted image for the region having a magnification that is not uniform across the region;

overlaying the distorted image on a second layer of the image to present an overlaid image on a display;

altering a presentation for the first layer on the display in response to edits made to the first layer;

propagating edits made to the first layer of the overlaid image through a presentation for the second layer on the display; and

saving edits made to the presentations for the first layer and the second layer as one or more bookmarks that permit subsequent recall and application to the first layer and the second layer.

49. The one or more non-transitory computer-readable media of claim 48, wherein the distorting further includes:

creating a lens surface for the distorted image; and

transforming the predetermined portion of the first layer by applying a distortion function to define the lens surface to the predetermined portion of the first layer.

50. The machine-implemented method of claim 20, wherein said saving comprises saving the altered digital representation for the first layer and the altered digital representation for the second layer to a disk drive.

51. The machine-implemented method of claim 20, wherein:

said distorting comprises producing a focal region with uniform magnification of the first layer and a plurality of shoulder regions about the focal region, and

each shoulder region of the plurality of shoulder regions presenting a different layer of the image with non-uniform magnification.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix))

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(x))

None.